

REMARKS

Applicants thank the Examiner for examining the application. Applicants have canceled claim 5 and have amended claims 1, 21, 24, 25, and 26 as described further below. Support for the amendment of claims 1, 21, 24, 25, and 26 may be found throughout the specification, and the amendment of claims 1, 21, 24, 25, and 26 does not constitute the addition of new matter. With the amendment, claims 1-4 and 6-27 are pending.

Applicants' Note

Applicants greatly appreciate the Examiner responding to Applicants' arguments made in the previous response. In the course of responding to Applicants' arguments, the Examiner makes a number of arguments regarding what Burbeck et al. teaches. However, the Examiner fails to provide any citations to Burbeck et al. to support these arguments. Without knowing to which portions of Burbeck et al. the Examiner is responding, Applicants find it impossible to address the Examiner's arguments. Applicants would greatly appreciate being given citations to Burbeck et al. for these arguments so that Applicants could properly respond.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

The Examiner rejected claims 1-27 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 7,143,139 to Burbeck et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,047,315 to Srivastava.

Applicants have amended Applicants' independent claim 1 to include the limitations formerly present in Applicants' dependent claim 5, now canceled. Applicants' amended independent claim 1 now requires, among other things, wherein the step of reconciling the current version vector comprises the steps of: comparing a least recent event number of the router that generated the update to the event number in the current version vector entry for that router; if the least recent event number is in series with the event numbers in the database as determined by the current version vector entry for

that other router, then entering the most recent event number of the received update into the current version vector entry for the router that generated the update of change events; and if the least recent event number in the update is not in succession to the event number in the current version vector entry for the router that generated the update of change events, then discarding the received update.

The Examiner cited to col. 23 lines 30-55, col. 11 lines 15-26, and col. 23 lines 30-65 of Burbeck et al. as teaching or suggesting these limitations.

However, neither the cited text nor any other text of Burbeck et al. teaches or suggests wherein the step of reconciling the current version vector comprises the steps of: comparing a least recent event number of the router that generated the update to the event number in the current version vector entry for that router; if the least recent event number is in series with the event numbers in the database as determined by the current version vector entry for that other router, then entering the most recent event number of the received update into the current version vector entry for the router that generated the update of change events; and if the least recent event number in the update is not in succession to the event number in the current version vector entry for the router that generated the update of change events, then discarding the received update, as required by Applicants' amended independent claim 1.

Regarding the comparing limitation, even if Applicants' accept the Examiner's arguments regarding claim 1 as true, Applicants see no comparison occurring in the cited text. The action verbs in each sentence in the cited text are as follows: prepends; provides; provides; updates; generated; forwarded; updates; stores; includes; encompasses; counts; counts; recomputed. In other words, there is no comparison of anything even remotely suggested, much less taught, by the cited text of Burbeck et al. Certainly the cited text of Burbeck et al. does not teach or suggest comparing a least recent event number of the router that generated the update to the event number in the current version vector entry for that router, as required by Applicants' amended independent claim 1.

Regarding the entering limitation, Applicants note that the action of entering takes place as a result of the comparing limitation. That is, entering occurs only if the least recent event number is in series with the event numbers in the database as determined by the current version vector entry for that other router. However, as shown above, Burbeck et al. does not teach or suggest the comparing limitation of Applicants' amended independent claim 1. Thus, it is impossible for Burbeck et al. to teach or suggest taking any actions, much less entering anything, and certainly not entering the most recent event number of the received update into the current version vector entry for the router that generated the update of change events, as is required by Applicants' amended independent claim 1.

Regarding the discarding limitation, col. 23 lines 30-65 of Burbeck et al. do not teach or suggest discarding anything. Indeed, the word "discard", nor its equivalent, does not appear anywhere in the cited text of Burbeck et al. Further, Applicants note that the action of discarding takes place as a result of the comparing limitation. However, as Applicants have shown above, Burbeck et al. does not teach or suggest the comparing limitation. Even if Applicants were to accept as true the Examiner's arguments that the update of the locally-stored content traversal path definition, and the update of the node's local reputation, is equivalent to Applicants' comparing limitation, there is nothing whatsoever in those lines of Burbeck et al. that teaches discarding anything, much less discarding a received update, for any reason, much less if the least recent event number in the update is not in succession to the event number in the current version vector entry for the router that generated the update of change events. All that col. 23 lines 56-65 of Burbeck et al. (not cited against the comparing limitation but cited against the discarding limitation) add is that a generated response message is digitally signed and returned to the requestor; see col. 23 lines 56-65. This has nothing whatsoever to do with discarding.

Thus, for at least any of the reasons given above, Burbeck et al. fails to teach or suggest Applicants' amended independent claim 1, and thus Applicants' amended

independent claim 1 is not obvious in light of Burbeck et al., either alone or in combination with Srivastava. Applicants' amended independent claim 1 is therefore allowable over Burbeck et al., either alone or in combination with Srivastava.

Applicants have amended Applicants' independent claims 21, 24, 25, and 26 similarly to Applicants' allowable amended independent claim 1. Thus, Applicants' amended independent claims 21, 24, 25, and 26 all include limitations similar to those of Applicants' allowable amended independent claim 1. Therefore, for at least the reason(s) given above with regards to Applicants' allowable amended independent claim 1, Applicants' amended independent claims 21, 24, 25, and 26 are themselves not taught or suggested by Burbeck et al., and thus, Applicants' amended independent claims 21, 24, 25, and 26 are allowable over Burbeck et al., either alone or in combination with Srivastava.

Applicants' dependent claims 2-4, 6-20, 22-23, and 27 depend from, respectively, Applicants' allowable amended independent claims 1, 21, and 26. Therefore, for at least the reason(s) given above with regards to Applicants' allowable amended independent claims 1, 21, and 26, Applicants' dependent claims 2-4, 6-20, 22-23, and 27 are themselves not taught or suggested by Burbeck et al., and thus, Applicants' dependent claims 2-4, 6-20, 22-23, and 27 are allowable over Burbeck et al., either alone or in combination with Srivastava.

CONCLUSION

Applicants believe this Amendment and Response to be fully responsive to the present Office Action. Thus, based on the foregoing Remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that this application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicants request allowance of the application.

Applicants hereby petition for any extension of time required to maintain the pendency of this case. If there is any fee occasioned by this response that is not paid, please charge any deficiency to Deposit Account No. 50-3735.

Should the enclosed papers or fees be considered incomplete, Applicants respectfully request that the Patent Office contact the undersigned collect at the telephone number provided below.

Applicants invite the Examiner to contact the Applicants' undersigned Attorney if any issues are deemed to remain prior to allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

_____/SPM/
Shaun P. Montana, Esq.
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Registration No.: 54,320
Chapin Intellectual Property Law, LLC
Westborough Office Park
1700 West Park Drive, Suite 280
Westborough, Massachusetts 01581
Telephone: (508) 616-9660
Facsimile: (508) 616-9661

Attorney Docket No.: CIS03-17(7429)

Dated: June 30, 2008